	Case 3:13-cv-00540-LRH-WGC Docume	ent 29 Filed 02/18/14 Page 1 of 2
1 2 3		
4		
5		
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
8		
9	ANTONIO L. DOYLE,	3:13-cv-00540-LRH-WGC
10	Plaintiff,	ORDER
11	vs.	re Plaintiff's Request for Entry of Default
12 13	FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD, VAEDRA ROSEMAN JONES and DAMIEN) C. JONES,	Doc. # 20
14	Defendants.)))
15 16	Before the court is Plaintiff's Motion for Default against Defendants Vaedra Roseman Jones and	
17	Damien Jones. (Doc. # 20). Defendant Vaedra Jones was served on September 16, 2013 (Doc. # 2) and	
18	Defendant Damien Jones accepted service on October 18, 2013 (Doc. # 7).	
19	In this court's order of January 24, 2014 (Doc. # 21), this court stated that	
20	Defendant Damien Jones accepted service on October 18, 2013 (Doc. # 7). Other than joining in Defendant Fairfax County School Board's	
21	Petition for Removal (Doc. # 1) and the Acceptance of Service filed by Damien Jones (Doc. # 7), it does not appear the Jones defendants have	
22	appeared further in this action.	es not appear the sones defendants have
23	(<i>Id.</i> at 1.)	
24	Although this court noted it appeared the	e Defendants had failed to plead or defend, nevertheless,
25	the court further stated that the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and cases interpreting rules on default	
26	prefer matters be litigated on their merits, and that defaults – and default judgments – are disfavored.	
27	Harvey v. United States, 685 F.3d 939, 946 (10th Cir. 2012); U.S. v. Signed Personal Check No. 730 o	
28	Yubran S. Mesle, 615 F.3d 1085, 1091 (9th Cir. 2010).	

Case 3:13-cv-00540-LRH-WGC Document 29 Filed 02/18/14 Page 2 of 2

Because these Defendants had joined in the Fairfax School Board Petition for Removal (Doc. # 1 at 3), the court concluded these Defendants indicated that they intend to defend this matter. Nevertheless, the court directed the Jones Defendants to file a responsive pleading on or before February 15, 2014; otherwise, the Clerk's Office would be directed to enter a default against the Defendants. (*Id.* at 2.)

On February 7, 2014, Defendants filed a Joint Motion to Dismiss. (Doc. # 22.) This motion constitutes an adequate response to Plaintiff's complaint. Accordingly, Plaintiff's Request for Entry of Default (Doc. # 20) is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: February 18, 2014.

William of Poble

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE